

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

**LUIS RANGEL FRIAS, #14131078,
aka MARIO EDUARDO PEDRAZA,
Plaintiff,**

v.

**DANIEL MEADE,
Defendant.**

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

3:13-CV-2007-N-BK

**ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

The United States Magistrate Judge made Findings, Conclusions, and a Recommendation in this case. Plaintiff/Petitioner filed objections, and the District Court has made a *de novo* review of those portions of the proposed findings and recommendation to which objection was made. The objections are overruled, and the Court **ACCEPTS** the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge.


IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that this action is summarily **DISMISSED** with prejudice as frivolous. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B) and 1915A(b). The dismissal under sections 1915(e)(2)(B) and 1915A(b) will count as a “strike” or “prior occasion” within the meaning 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).²

The Court **CERTIFIES** that any appeal of this action would not be taken in good faith. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3). In support of this finding, the Court adopts and incorporates by

² Section 1915(g), commonly known as the “three-strikes” provision, provides: “[i]n no event shall a prisoner bring a civil action or appeal a judgment in a civil action or proceeding under this section, if the prisoner has, on 3 or more prior occasions, while incarcerated or detained in any facility, brought an action or appeal in a court of the United States that was dismissed on the grounds that it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, unless the prisoner is under imminent danger of serious physical injury.”

reference the Magistrate Judge's Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation. *See Baugh v. Taylor*, 117 F.3d 197, 202 n.21 (5th Cir. 1997). Based on the above Order, the Court finds that any appeal of this action would present no legal point of arguable merit and would, therefore, be frivolous. *Howard v. King*, 707 F.2d 215, 220 (5th Cir. 1983).

SO ORDERED this 20th day of September, 2013.


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE